P-5540-C1

10/662,196

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application and entry of the amendment are respectfully requested. Claims 1 to 27 are currently pending, claims 20 to 27 have been amended, and claim 19 has been canceled.

The Office Action mailed March 25, 2004 addressed claims 1 to 27. Claims 19 to 26 were rejected, claim 27 was objected to, and claims 1 to 18 were allowed.

The declaration was objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.63 as being an improper continuation application. The Examiner stated that the matter in claim 27 was not presented in the prior application, therefore the declaration must be changed to reflect the additionally recited matter and state that this application is a continuation-in-part of Application No. 09/760,215. Additionally, the specification was objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. The Examiner stated that Applicant has improperly stated that this application is a continuation of prior Application No. 09/760,215, but this application adds additional disclosure (claim 27), therefore it must be changed to a continuation-in-part instead of a continuation.

Although Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that the matter of claim 27 is supported by the original application, in an effort to hasten prosecution, claim 27 has been amended. Claim 27 now claims a specific gravity of about 1.18 instead of about 1.18 or less, as originally claimed. Support for this limitation may be found at page 8, Table 2, Example 1, wherein the inner cover has a specific gravity of 1.18. Since the matter of claim 27 is supported in the original application, Applicants have not provided a new declaration and this application has not been changed to a continuation-in-part application.

Applicants respectfully submit that the objections to the declaration and specification have been overcome. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the objections to the declaration and specification be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 19, 20, 23 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Asakura et al. (5,730,664) in view of Yamagishi et al. (5,779,563). Claims 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Asakura et al. in view of Moriyama et al. (5,713,802). Claim 24 was rejected under

P-5540-C1

10/662,196

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Asakura et al. in view of Sullivan (4,884,814). Claim 25 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Asakura et al. in view of Egashira (5,714,546).

Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner, in an effort to hasten prosecution, claim 27 has been amended to incorporate the limitation of claim 19. Claim 27 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but the Examiner indicated it would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 19 has been canceled, and claims 20 to 26 have been amended to depend from claim 27.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 19 to 27 are not obvious over Asakura in view of the various patents. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 20 to 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' attorney if it is deemed that a telephone conversation will hasten prosecution of the application.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of each of the presently rejected claims, claims 19 to 27. Applicants respectfully request allowance of claims 1 to 18 and 20 to 27, the claims currently pending.

Respectfully submitted,

MARK L. BINETTE ET AL.

Customer No. 24492 Phone: (413) 322-2937

Michelle Bugbee, Reg. No.

Attorney for Applicants

The Top-Flite Golf Company

A wholly-owned subsidiary of Callaway Golf Company

425 Meadow Street

P.O. Box 901

Chicopee, MA 01021-0901

cc: Richard M. Klein, Esquire (SLD 2 00219-1)